

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2013-14**

**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** *Political Science and Public Administration* \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE** 2/6/15 \_\_\_\_\_

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** B.A. Political Science and B.S.P.A. Public Administration \_\_\_\_\_

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Surojit Gupta and Mary K. Askim-Lovseth \_\_\_\_\_

**1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**

- |                                       |                    |          |                     |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|----------|---------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced?          | YES <u>X</u> _____ | NO _____ | QUALIFIED Y/N _____ |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u>X</u> _____ | NO _____ | QUALIFIED Y/N _____ |
| • Do goals address student learning?  | YES <u>X</u> _____ | NO _____ | QUALIFIED Y/N _____ |

***Comments:***

*The Department offers two undergraduate majors, both sharing the same set of student learning goals (SLG). Three of the goals related to skills and the fourth to content, "Students will develop an understanding of the discipline in which they are being educated." The language of the content goal reflected applicability to each of the majors. For the academic year reviewed, three goals were assessed for both programs—critical thinking, written communication, and oral communication.*

*Student learning goals are well articulated.*

*The most recent Assessment Plan posted was May 2011.*

In addition to the program goals, please also consider UND's institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to program goals.

- X   1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience")
- X   2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
- X   3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("apply empirical data...analyze graphical information")
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use")
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...")
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning")
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for their communities and for the world")

***Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals:***

*The three student learning goals that relate to skills directly align with critical thinking (SLG 1) and communication (SLGs 2 and 3). The narrative of the plan indicated the Department faculty believes "the development of critical thinking abilities foster intellectual curiosity and creativity." Though not explicitly stated in the goal, the Department implies it.*

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

- |  |                    |          |                     |
|--|--------------------|----------|---------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   | YES <u>X</u> _____ | NO _____ | QUALIFIED Y/N _____ |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?        | YES <u>X</u> _____ | NO _____ | QUALIFIED Y/N _____ |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | YES <u>X</u> _____ | NO _____ | QUALIFIED Y/N _____ |

**Comments:**

*The Department used both indirect and direct methods. For the two degrees within the undergraduate program, assessment was conducted within the context of Senior Colloquium (capstone) course. For direct assessment, the Department used “papers that student write and present as the main artifacts for evaluation.” The Department used “the paper to assess critical thinking and written communication.” Assessment was then “conducted through the application of two rubrics adopted by the university for this purpose. Oral communication was also assessed using a university-developed rubric but the artifact in this case is the formal presentation of the research project.” For the written and oral communication rubric, the benchmark is ‘2’ for each dimension (range of 0-3); for critical thinking, the benchmark is ‘1’ (range of 0-2).*

*For indirect assessment, the Department used a ‘course mapping’ exercise that asked students to rate, using a five-point scale, how well each core course achieved the four goals (5, extremely well and 1, not well at all). The benchmark is 2.5.*

**3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments:**

*The Department presented means for each of the dimensions for the three skills; the data were differentiated by program. Faculty saw no distinct differences between the programs regarding student performance. The percentage of students who achieved the benchmark for each skill dimension were also reported but with no differentiation by program. The percentages ranged from 84 to 90. For critical thinking, a percentage was reported of those students who achieve the outstanding rating of 2 on each dimension (range of 53 to 56%). The Department tracked this to determine the gap between satisfactory and outstanding as its idealistic goal is to have all students at the outstanding level for critical thinking.*

*The student course mapping survey, which is the Department’s indirect assessment measure, was completed for both programs and the mean data reported separately. For the Political Science program, the early courses in a student’s program enhanced the oral communication skill the least; but the capstone course had its greatest impact on this skill (mean of 3.97). Fewer courses were reported for the Public Administration program and oral communication was again noted as the skill that was enhanced the least in particular courses.*

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below.

- ☒ X 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)  
☒ X 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)  
☐ 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)  
☐ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)  
☐ 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)  
☐ 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)  
☐ 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)  
☐ 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

**Comments regarding results and the application of results to program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:**

*The Department presented results on both communication and critical thinking for both programs.*

#### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N X \_\_\_\_\_

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N X \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Comments:**

*Department faculty discussed the assessment results in early Fall with no definitive closing the loop activities decided. The drop in critical thinking skills may have been as a result of instructor change (i.e., pedagogy or teaching style may be different between instructors) so this will be monitored. There will be an attempt to “integrate opportunities for formal oral presentations” into the 200 level courses but no actual plan was developed to do so, only the generation of ideas of how to implement.*

#### **SUMMARY**

##### ***Strengths***

- X A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- X Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- X Assessment methods are clearly described.
- X Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- X Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- X Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- X Results are reported.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Results are tied to closing the loop.  
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

##### ***Areas for Improvement***

- \_\_\_\_\_ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- \_\_\_\_\_ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- \_\_\_\_\_ No results are reported.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.  
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

#### **OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

*The Department does well with its assessment process for its two programs. It systematically collects data and has a dialogue regarding the results.*

*It would be helpful if the student learning goal related to content (SLG 4) had objectives for each major that identified specific knowledge outcomes. This would assist with closing the loop activities, knowing what concepts were/were not meeting expectations. Related to this, the Assessment Plan noted the use of POLS 115 to assess the content goal. This course is an entry-level course for both programs and would not be the best choice to determine the students’ “understanding of the discipline in which they are being educated.” Selection of an artifact or course(s) closer to the end of each program would be more appropriate as the student learning goals reflect the competencies to be achieved at programs’ end. The plan noted that it was “common practice” for students in the capstone to prepare and deliver a lecture in POLS 115 and that their presentations were assessed. If the Department uses the presentation as a measurement tool to assess SLG 4, it would be best to include this in the plan.*

#### **MATERIALS REVIEWED**

- X Annual assessment report
- \_\_\_\_\_ Annual Report
- X Assessment plan (as posted)
- X Previous assessment review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please describe)

Reviewer(s):	Name	<i>Surojit Gupta</i>	<i>Mary K. Askim-Lovseth</i>
	Department	<i>Mechanical Engineering</i>	<i>Marketing</i>
	Phone Number	<i>777-1632</i>	<i>777-2930</i>
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:surojit.gupta@und.edu"><i>surojit.gupta@und.edu</i></a>	<a href="mailto:maskim@business.und.edu"><i>maskim@business.und.edu</i></a>

---

Section 1: \_\_Y\_\_    Section 2: \_\_Y\_\_    Section 3: \_\_Y\_\_    Section 4: \_\_Q\_\_

**Coding Key:**

- Y    = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other years)
- Q    = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N    = no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

*Revised Sept 24, 2014*

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2013-14**

**GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Political Science and Public Administration **DATE** 2/6/15

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** Masters in Public Administration

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Surojit Gupta and Mary K. Askim-Lovseth

**1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**

- |                                       |              |                |                           |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced?          | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were goals well-articulated? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning?  | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |

**Comments:**

*The Assessment Plan posted was updated March 2012 as a result of “new accreditation standards, and the assessment of new universal competencies” adopted by the program’s accrediting body, NASPAA. The program has five student learning objectives, and reported working on aligning those objectives with the 21 indicators/dimensions over four competency areas (noted in the Annual Report, but the Plan indicated five competencies). The Department has traditionally used a two-year cycle to assess all of the objectives and is nearing completion of another cycle.*

*The student learning objectives for the program are embedded in the Annual Report but there is no reference to them in the Assessment Plan, only the competencies.*

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

- |  |              |                |                           |
|--|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?        | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |

**Comments:**

*The Department used a matrix in the Assessment Plan to align the direct and indirect assessment methods with the indicators of the competencies. Direct methods were numerous—comps, cases, exam questions, papers, pre/post questionnaires, diversity survey and interview, independent studies, and independent study and other presentations. Indirect methods included an exit survey and surveys of alumni, government officials, and supervisors. There was also reference to scales and rubrics being used with some benchmarks being noted.*

**3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

- |  |                 |                |                           |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported?  | YES <u>X</u>    | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES <u>X</u>    | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?            | YES <u>    </u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u>    |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning?   | YES <u>X</u>    | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |

**Comments:**

*The Department selected to report on one of the competencies, "To articulate and apply a public service perspective." This competency had four indicators/dimensions of competency. It was noted how each competency aligned with the program's specific student learning objectives.*

*The first dimension, appreciating competing values, was assessed with an exam question using a rubric that had a four-point scale (1, high; 4, low). The mean of the ten students sampled was 2.27. The pass rate of the comprehensive exam was used to assess the second dimension--an understanding of public administration, its frameworks and perspectives. The pass rate of Summer 2012 through Summer 2013 students was 87.5%; the pass rate for Fall 2013 through Summer 2014 was 100%. The third dimension related to diversity and the Department has been collecting data for almost two years using a diversity awareness questionnaire as a pre- and post-measure as the student progresses through the program. Though no data were reported from this measure for diversity, other indirect results were provided that came from supervisors of MPA graduates. On a five-point scale of '1' being excellent and '5' being poor, the mean responses to two of the questions that related to equipping students and the graduates working with clients from diverse groups and populations were 2.5 and 2.0, respectively. The fourth dimension, relating to the profession's code of ethics, was assessed with a case study artifact from a sampling of students from Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 semesters. The Assessment Plan indicated a rubric was to be used as the measurement tool. Percentage of responses meeting the standard were 50, 40, and 10. It was unclear if the rubric had three distinct criteria related to the dimension that would align with the percentages. The indirect measures for this dimension were graduate and employer surveys. Results reported were a mean rating of 1.11 on a five-point scale (1, excellent; 5, poor).*

*It is not clear how the Department is using these results to specifically identify the need for improvement as the Department seems to be in the process of evaluating the results, for example in competency areas 3 and 4.*

**4. CLOSING THE LOOP**

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES\_\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_X\_

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES\_\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_X\_

**Comments:**

*The Department is in the process of reviewing the results to determine closing the loop activities. Comments were provided of past activities, such as adding a case assignment on an ethical issue. Results indicated a need for improved pedagogy and/or a better evaluative tool. With high passage rates for the comprehensive exam, no specific actions have been taken.*

**SUMMARY*****Strengths***

- \_\_\_\_\_ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- X Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- X Assessment methods are clearly described.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Results are reported.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Results are tied to closing the loop.
- (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

***Areas for Improvement***

- \_\_\_\_\_ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- \_\_\_\_\_ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- \_\_\_\_\_ No results are reported.
- X Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
- (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

## OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

*The Department has developed a more comprehensive assessment plan for the MPA program since its last review and the Committee acknowledges its efforts. The data that are collected should provide insight into improvements for the program that can enhance student learning. The Department noted one area of concern, “understand and apply profession’s code of ethics to situations and decisions.”*

*With competencies determined by an accrediting body, it can be difficult to directly align these competencies with a program’s student learning objectives. It would be helpful to identify the objectives in the Assessment Plan and illustrate how the data collected for the competencies will be linked to the objectives for loop closing.*

## MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☒ Annual assessment report
- ☐ Annual report
- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ☒ Previous assessment review
- ☐ Other (please describe)

Reviewer(s):	Name	Surojit Gupta	Mary K. Askim-Lovseth
	Department	Mechanical Engineering	Marketing
	Phone Number	777-1632	777-2930
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:surojit.gupta@und.edu">surojit.gupta@und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:maskim@business.und.edu">maskim@business.und.edu</a>

Section 1: ☒ Y ☐ N    Section 2: ☒ Y ☐ N    Section 3: ☒ Y ☐ N    Section 4: ☒ Q ☐ N

### Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

*Revised Sept 24, 2014*

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2013-14** (Academic year)

**GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Political Science & Public Administration **DATE** 04/29/15

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW :** Certificates in Social Entrepreneurship, Public Policy Analysis, Public Administration, and Health Care Administration

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Surojit Gupta and Mary K. Askim-Lovseth

**1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**

- |                                       |              |              |                         |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced?          | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |
| • If so, were goals well-articulated? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning?  | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |

**Comments:**

*The four graduate level certificate programs have a new Assessment Plan that was completed Summer 2013 (the Department filed new plans with University Assessment Office on September 9, 2013). Prior to this, the assessment of the four programs was embedded in the MPA assessment plan. The Department indicated a transition to the new plan by Fall 2016, yet it was noted that students will be assessed under the new plan Spring 2015. It is assumed that in the interim current students must be assessed under the old plan.*

*According to the assessment plan, each certificate has a respective goal that relates to the field of study that addresses knowledge and/or skills. The annual report referenced two goals, problem-solving abilities and knowledge, and "other goals." This should be clarified if additional goals were added.*

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

- |  |              |              |                         |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?        | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |

**Comments:**

*The assessment plan indicated both direct and indirect assessment methods for the respective certificates. These included a portfolio project (paper from each class), oral presentation of the portfolio, and a "reflective statement related to the competency." It is noted that a rubric will be used to assess the presentation and artifacts. In addition, the annual report noted an exit survey. It is unclear if this is an additional indirect method or if the reflective statement and exit survey are one and the same.*

**3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

- |  |               |              |                         |
|--|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported?  | YES <u>  </u> | NO <u>X</u>  | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES <u>  </u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |



- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?
- Were the results tied to goals for student learning?

YES\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_ \_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_

YES\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_ \_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

*No results were reported.*

#### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_X\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_ \_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

*No closing the loop comments were noted.*

#### SUMMARY

##### *Strengths*

- ☒ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☒ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☒ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ☐ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ☐ Results are reported.
- ☐ Results are tied to closing the loop.  
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

##### *Areas for Improvement*

- ☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- ☐ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- ☒ No results are reported.
- ☐ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.  
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

#### OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

*The Department has developed a new assessment plan for each certificate. The Committee is looking forward to seeing the results when they are put in place. It seems that the Department did not report any assessment of student learning when the MPA assessment plan encompassed the certificate since students are not being assessed until Spring 2015 under the new plan.*

*The Department should see if additional goals are to be added to the posted plans as there was reference to additional goals in the annual report.*

#### MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☒ Annual assessment report
- ☐ Annual report
- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ☐ Previous assessment review
- ☐ Other (please describe)

Reviewer(s):	Name	<i>Surojit Gupta</i>	<i>Mary K. Askim-Lovseth</i>
	Department	<i>Mechanical Engineering</i>	<i>Marketing</i>
	Phone Number	<i>777-1632</i>	<i>777-2930</i>
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:surojit.gupta@und.edu"><u>surojit.gupta@und.edu</u></a>	<a href="mailto:maskim@business.und.edu"><u>maskim@business.und.edu</u></a>

---

Section 1: \_\_Y\_\_    Section 2: \_\_Y\_\_    Section 3: \_\_N\_\_    Section 4: \_\_N\_\_

Coding Key:

- Y    = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- Q    = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N    = no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

*Revised Sept 24, 2014*